UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,936	09/20/2005	Jordi Tormo i Blasco	5000-0133PUS1	7901
	7590 03/18/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747		RAO, DEEPAK R		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/549,936	I BLASCO ET AL.					
Examiner-initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Deepak Rao	1624					
All Participants:	Status of Application: Afte	r Non-final Rejection					
(1) <u>Deepak Rao</u> .	(3)						
(2) Mr. Thomas Siepmann, Applicant's Representative. (4)							
Date of Interview: 3 March 2008	Time:						
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:							
Part I.							
Rejection(s) discussed: 103 rejection							
Claims discussed:							
1, 3							
Prior art documents discussed: Dow							
Part II.							
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Applicant submitted translation/certified copy of foreign priority document to overcome the reference. Examiner indicated that the priority document does not fully support the definitions of L and R3 in claims 1 and 3. Specifically, the term 'L' as defined in the instant claims contains 'nitro, -C(=S)-N(A')A, and -C(=NA')-SA' and R3 contains '-C(=S)-NRaRb' which terms are not present in the priority document. Mr. Siepmann indicated that the claims will be amended such that the claims 1 and 3 are consistent with the priority document. Additionally, Mr. Siepmann indicated that new claim(s) may be added to cover the terms deleted from claim 1, as the reference of record does not include the above terms. Examiner indicated that a supplemental amendment (with the changes discussed) may be filed for further consideration.							
Part III.							
 ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 							
/Deepak Rao/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624 (A)	oplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)					